IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO.1983 OF 2007

Pandurang Dnyandeo Markad .. Petitioner
v/s.
State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Mr. A.V. Anturkar for Mr. Sugandh Deshmukh for the petitioner.
Mr. V.P. Malwankar, Assistant Government Pleader for the respondents.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO &
R.M. SAVANT, JJ.

DATED : 26TH MARCH, 2007

P.C.

Rule. Heard forthwith.

2. The case of the petitioner is that considering the order dated 30th June, 2003, he is also entitled to the same reliefs. The communication dated 26.12.2002 had set out the period to be from 1st July, 2002 to 30th June, 2007. The amounts payable were set out therein. The petitioner, however, was allowed to operate the contract only from 23rd December, 2002. In the matter pertaining to an administrative order, it is not for this court to interfere with an order except the decision making process. See Tata Cellular v. Union of India, (1994)7 SCC 651.

3. Considering the law, in our opinion, it will not be appropriate for this court to pass an order directing the respondents to extend the

period of contract. However, considering the fact that the petitioner was not given the entire period in respect of which he has been charged and considering that other similarly situated contractors got the benefit of the order passed by the Aurangabad Bench of this court, the representation made by the petitioner be considered in any case not later than four weeks from today.

Rule made absolute accordingly. No order as to costs.

(F.I. REBELLO, J.)

(R.M. SAVANT, J.)